From Armenian Smyrna/Izmir,

Volume 11 in the series *Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, edited by Richard G. Hovannisian (Costa Mesa, 2012), Chapter 5, pp. 111-126.

Works Relating to Armenian Linguistics, at Internet Archive



## THE ARMENIAN DIALECT OF SMYRNA

#### Bert Vaux

#### 1. Introduction

Little has been written about the Armenian dialect of Smyrna, which now appears to be extinct, yet it arguably played a central role in the development of Standard Western Armenian (SWA), thanks to the efforts of the nineteenth-century American missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions who had a post in Smyrna and apparently based the language of their proselytizing texts on the local speech patterns of the city.\* This essay reviews what is known about the traditional Smyrna dialect from dialectological sources and compares them to materials from what is arguably the first grammar devoted entirely to what is now regarded as Standard Western Armenian<sup>1</sup>, the *K'erakanut'iwn Angghiarēn ev Hayerēn* (English and Armenian Grammar) published anonymously in Smyrna/İzmir in 1835.<sup>2</sup> This is one of the earliest attempts to stan-

<sup>\*</sup> Thanks to Chip Coakley, David Ghoogasian, and Richard Hovannisian for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Mkhit'ar Sebastats'i (1727) presents a form of the language quite different from what would now be thought of as Standard Western Armenian, and Jacques-Chahan Cirbied (1823) presents fragments of dozens of varieties of Armenian. Citations in the text are rendered by the last name of the author, year of publication, and, where applicable, page or paragraph (§) number, as in Anonymous 1835:90 or Karst 1901:§364. For these sources, see the list of references at the end of this chapter.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The ABCFM annual report for 1836 (pp. 45-46) states that "Sarkis, a pious Armenian, eminent as a scholar in his own language, and accurate in his habits of thought, was sent from Constantinople to Smyrna to assist Mr. Adger in correcting the press, and to be otherwise employed in the book-making department. The first work put to press was an Armenian and English grammar, prepared by Mr. Dwight, and much needed by the Armenian youth to enable them to acquire a knowledge of English, and to enter the world of thought which exists in that language." The Mr.

112 Bert Vaux

dardize Modern Armenian, though in a form noticeably closer to the spoken language of the region than what survives in the standard language today. Regional forms such as <code>hphp</code> irek<sup>h3</sup> "3"; <code>mmulpuhlp</code> dasnevine "19"; <code>pumluhplm</code> k<sup>h</sup>esanvergu "22"; and <code>lipum</code> nist "sit!" abound, as well as forms of Turkish origin such as <code>pupml</code> tf<sup>h</sup>at<sup>h</sup>al "fork" excised from the standard language following the Armenian Genocide.

# 2. The Place of Smyrna among the Traditional Armenian Dialects

S.M. Tsots'ikean (1947:213) opines that "[Smyrna's] mother dialect is . . . very similar to that of Istanbul. But at the same time the Smyrna Armenians have their own unique expressions, and sometimes even different pronunciations, as well as a set of unique words." Hrant Petrosyan (1987:213) is somewhat more specific, identifying Smyrna as a Western Armenian dialect of the  $\mu_{L}$  go branch, related to Constantinople and especially Tokat. Some of the Western phonological features that are found in Smyrna include the shift of original plain voiced stops to voiceless aspirates (Gevork' Jahukyan's (1972) feature 1—for

Dwight referred to here is Harrison Gray Otis Dwight, one of the main missionaries sent to Constantinople to work with the Armenians by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. The Sarkis mentioned here is most likely the "Sarkis Vartabed. . .a teacher of grammar in the school of Peshtimaljian" mentioned by Anderson and Vinton 1872 (vol. 1, p. 100). Unfortunately I have been unable to determine where this Sarkis was raised; the fact that he was assigned to teach in Constantinople does not entail that he grew up there. Both Dwight and Sarkis were based in Constantinople, and the forms in their grammar find numerous parallels in the colloquial Constantinopolitan Armenian of the time, but the striking resemblances of the materials in the grammar to what we know about Smyrna Armenian and the fact that the ABCFM had a base in Smyrna and was likely to have drawn on the language of its Armenian consultants there have led me to include the work here.

Elias Riggs' important 1847 grammar of Western Armenian may reveal elements of Smyrna Armenian as well, but reviewing these lies beyond the scope of the present discussion.

<sup>3</sup> For the general reader, Armenologists, and linguists alike, I render all linguistic forms in both Armenian script and the International Phonetic Alphabet (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:IPA\_chart\_2005\_png.svg). References and names, on the other hand, are rendered in the ALA-LC system (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romanization\_of\_Armenian#ALA-LC\_.281997.29) so as to facilitate bibliographic research.

<sup>4</sup> This archaic form is also preserved in Nor Nakhichevan; contrast with SWA humhn nəstif, Constantinople humh nəste.

example, Common Armenian phphul berem "I bring" > Smyrna pherem "I bring" (subjunctive)), and the transposition of original plain voice-less stops to voiced unaspirated (Jahukyan's feature 5—for example, Common Armenian unuulu tasn "ten" > Smyrna dasə). Morphological westernisms include the use of up go and unu gu to mark the present and imperfect, for example, unuquulu puuluh unuu gankhunə khaniji gudas "at what will you sell it per yard?" (Anonymous 1835:90), and the ablative in -t -e (Jahukyan's feature 58, for example, hull isme "from me" (Anonymous 1835:61), cf. SWA hubult indzme) as opposed to Eastern -hg-itsh. Western syntactic features include the placement of the indefinite article after its host (Jahukyan's feature 71), as in unpulbumulut arvest mon e "it's an art" (Anonymous 1835). Jahukyan (1972:33) assigns Smyrna a separate node (Dialect 12) within his Western group of Armenian dialects.

## 2.1. Phonology

The phonology of the Smyrna dialect appears to have been of a fairly typical Western type.

#### **2.1.1. Vowels**

In terms of the vowel system, Jahukyan (1972) claims that the dialect possessed the front vowels  $\xi_{uu}$  æ,  $\xi_{o}$  ø,  $h_{u}$  y found in Turkish but not SWA (his feature 34); the same is echoed by Petrosyan (1987:213). There is no evidence for this feature in the anonymous 1835 grammar (save the Turkish loan  $un\xi_{o}\xi t u$  døse "bed") or in Tsots'ikean (1947), though this absence may be due to the fact that these non-linguistic sources paid little attention to phonetic detail. Another Turkish feature claimed by Jahukyan and Petrosyan to surface in Smyrna is the change of p a to a full vowel (Jahukyan's feature 39), presumably assimilating to a neighboring vowel via vowel harmony. Neither source provides any examples of this phenomenon, and none appear in the anonymous 1835 grammar unless the verb in (1) below qualifies:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Throughout this chapter, I reproduce the anonymous author's sometimes awkward English translations.

(1)

(´) Աս ձեւը նշան որ ձայնաւորի վրայ դրուած ըլլանէ, պէտք է արագ զուրցել

as tsheve nesan vor tshajnavori vera thervadz el:a ne, betkhe arakh zurtshel "If this symbol ['] is placed over a vowel, it must be pronounced quickly."

Here the anonymous grammar uses  $qnlpgl_l$  zurts<sup>h</sup>ɛl where SWA has  $qpnlgl_l$  zəruts<sup>h</sup>ɛl. This may be a simple case of metathesis, but it is also possible that the author was attempting to render a pronunciation  $qnlpnlgl_l$  zuruts<sup>h</sup>ɛl, wherein the schwa (ə) of the first syllable has assimilated completely to the u of the second, which would be a case of Jahukyan's feature 39.

On the other hand, Anonymous does provide many forms demonstrating that Smyrna was like most (and perhaps all) non-standard Armenian varieties in monophthongizing original diphthongs, as can be seen in the examples in (2) below:

(2) Monophthongization of original diphthongs in the anonymous 1835 grammar:

Classical	Smyrna	gloss
	a. oj > u	
լոյս lojs	Įncu lus	light (66)
<i>ρηլ</i> η k <sup>h</sup> ojι	<i>քուր</i> k <sup>h</sup> uí	sister (70)
	b. iw > u	
ձիւն dziwn	ຂໍ <i>ກະໂ</i> ມ ts <sup>h</sup> un	snow (66)
արիւն ariwn	<i>արուն</i> arun	blood (69)
մրջիւն mrdʒiwn	<i>ນິ<sub>ເ</sub></i> າຣຸກເົນ mərt∫ <sup>h</sup> un	ant (74)
	c. aj > a	
<i>ш</i> µ ajs	ши as	this
шиор ajsof	шиор asof	today (65)
ձայն dzajn	ຂໍພົມ ts <sup>h</sup> an	sound (67)
եղբայր etbaji	шришр ахраг	brother (70)
<i>Տայր</i> hajr	<i>Sшр</i> har	father (71)
<i>մայր</i> majr	մար mar	mother (71)
որբեւայրի orbewajri	<i>որբէվարի կնիկ</i> ofp <sup>h</sup> εvari gənig	widow (71)
երկայն erkajn	երկան ergan	long (82)

μωμ lajn μωμ lan wide (82)

Smyrna also shows diphthongization of original L- e- in monosyllables but not elsewhere (Jahukyan's feature 32, also mentioned by Petrosyan 1987:213), as in (3) below:

# (3) Preservation of original monophthongs in polysyllables in the anonymous 1835 grammar:

SWA	Smyrna	gloss	
<i>կէսօրէ ետք</i> gesore jedk <sup>h</sup>	<i>էտինք</i> εdink <sup>h</sup>	afternoon (65)	
<i>երէկ</i> jεɾεg	<i>էրէկ</i> ៩ខែg	yesterday (65)	

#### 2.1.2. Consonants

Turning to consonants, Jahukyan (1972) notes that, in addition to the Western shifts in voicing and aspiration mentioned earlier, Smyrna sometimes shows devoicing and aspiration in non-initial position (feature 7), which can be seen in the anonymous 1835 grammar, for example, in its form for "shirt" on page 79, zmupp Jabikh (cf. SWA zmuph Jabig). Jahukyan adds that Smyrna displays his feature 13, deaffrication of original affricates, which can be seen in the forms from Tsots'ikean (1947) in (4) below:

#### (4) Deaffrication:

SWA	Smyrna	gloss
<i>อุเมายูท</i> k <sup>h</sup> aʁtsʰəɾ	<i>อิเกปกโ</i> ห <sub>ื</sub> ขหรอเ	sweet
<i>գործեր</i> k <sup>h</sup> ordzer	<i>քորղեր</i> k <sup>h</sup> orzer	deeds
<i>ឃប់៤៤p</i> ants <sup>h</sup> ៩វ	<i>យប់ច្បង</i> ្គា anzer	people, individuals
<i>ինծմէ</i> indzmε	<i>իսմէ</i> ismɛ <sup>6</sup>	from me
	_	(Anonymous 1835:61)

Jahukyan adds that Smyrna shows feature 19, devoicing of  $\eta$   $\mu$  in word-initial position, which can be seen in the anonymous 1835

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> It is also possible that this form contains the reduced form of hu jes, hu is, found in archaic SWA accusative q-hu z-is "me," rather than showing deaffrication from original hu indz.

grammar in [uplhtu] xəfgɛm "I send" < nphtul Bəfgɛm < Common Armenian nunuphtu] uBafkɛm.

It can also be seen from the 1835 grammar that Smyrna was like most modern varieties of Armenian in voicing unaspirated stops after nasal consonants; for example, on page 75 we find  $muh\delta h \delta mn$  dandzi dzar "pear tree" (cf. Classical  $muh\delta$  tandz "pear" > SWA dantsh, with the tsh expected in the Smyrna form) and  $huh\delta nph \delta mn$  xəndzori dzar "apple tree" (cf. Classical  $huh\delta nph$  xəndzor "apple" > SWA xəntshor). In these particular forms (and in isolated dialect remnants in SWA such as  $huh\delta h$  indzi "to me" < Classical  $huh\delta h$  indz, where one should otherwise expect the SWA outcome to be  $huh\delta h$  intsh) the original voicing of the affricate is preserved, but in Eastern dialects the process applies to original voiceless stops as well.

The transcriptions employed in the anonymous 1835 grammar further reveal an aspect of modern Armenian pronunciation that also holds for the standard Eastern and Western varieties, but is not written in the standard orthography: clitics (unstressed words) are written together with their host, indicating fused pronunciation as part of the same prosodic word, as already seen with pywht əlla ne "if it is" in (1) and can be seen in wpnchundput arvest mon e "it's an art," hppppput go tshotshone "it shows," hpudpu gosvin "are called," and puhupthu lancul hp hunptput phuhub baxtein lezun go xontheek ne pherem "shall I give you a piece of tongue?" (p. 85).

## 2.2. Morphology

Smyrna's morphological system is fairly typical for a Western dialect, as can be seen in the above-mentioned ablative suffix — \( \tau\_{\tau}, \) present/imperfect prefix \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) ga / \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) gu, and —i pronominal augment (Jahukyan's feature 65, for example, Common Armenian \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) indz "to me" > Smyrna \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) indzi). In other respects Smyrna is more conservative than SWA, preserving according to Jahukyan the original -\( \lambda\_{\tau} \)—u-conjugation (as in \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) "I quit" in the anonymous 1835 grammar, p. 46), the Middle Armenian -\( \lambda\_{\tau} \) —vi (Karst 1901:190) and -\( \lambda\_{\tau} \) \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) pulp ik honk "er) and \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) pulp \( \tau\_{\tau} \) the hands" (Anonymous 1835:98; cf. SWA \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) \( \lambda\_{\tau} \) pulp \( \tau\_{\tau} \) the original — u- of the causative suffix, as can be seen in the forms from the anonymous 1835 grammar in (5) below:

### (5) Causatives in Anonymous:

SWA	Smyrna	gloss
<i>រោឃ</i> ខ្ពស្ធរ	տակցունեմ	I heat
dak <sup>h</sup> ts <sup>h</sup> ənɛm	dagts <sup>h</sup> unem (p. 45)	
վերցնեմ	վերցունեմ	I lift
verts <sup>h</sup> ənem	verts <sup>h</sup> unem (p. 46)	
<i>կերցնեմ</i>	կիշտացունեմ	I feed
gefts <sup>h</sup> ənem	giʃtatsʰunɛm (p. 47)	
արագացնել	արտորցունեմ	I speed
arak <sup>h</sup> ats <sup>h</sup> ənel	ardorts <sup>h</sup> unem (p. 47)	[up something]
կորսնցնեմ	կորսնցունեմ	I lose
gorsənts <sup>h</sup> ənem	gorsənts <sup>h</sup> unem (p. 48)	
<i>Տ</i> նչեցնեմ	Հնչեցունեմ՝	I ring
hənt∫ <sup>h</sup> ɛts <sup>h</sup> nɛm	həntf <sup>h</sup> ets <sup>h</sup> unem (p. 51)	

 ver elanem, and *μουել* χοsel "speak" (Anonymous 1835:3); SWA *μουή* μοσεί < Common Armenian *μυμιμή* χawsil.

One of the most interesting morphological innovations found in Smyrna involves the progressive aspect. In late Classical Armenian, the simple present tense was formed by conjugating the bare verb (for example, phphil betem "I carry"), whereas the progressive was formed by combining this with the verb \(\lambda \mu\_{\mu}\) kaj "there exists" (for example, \(\lambda \mu\_{\mu}\) n\_L phphil kaj u betem "I am carrying" (Vaux 1995, Karst 1901:\§364)). By the Middle Armenian period, this progressive construction had grammaticalized (at least in Cilicia) to the \(\lambda n\_{\mu}\) gu construction we recognize from SWA, leaving a gap in the progressive slot. This was filled in by different dialects in a wide variety of ways, two of which are reported for Smyrna.

Several Western dialects add a progressive enclitic  $\mu \omega$  ga to the new present tense (Jahukyan feature 79), which may be simply from  $\mu \omega_{l}$  kaj; Smyrna, for example, has forms such as  $\mu \omega_{l}$   $\mu \omega_{l}$  ga vazi ga "it's raining" (cf. SWA  $\omega \omega_{l}$   $\omega_{l}$   $\omega_{l}$   $\omega_{l}$   $\omega_{l}$  and  $\omega_{l}$   $\omega_{l$ 

A further set of dialects goes one step further and adds the relative pronoun np of to this ga, yielding the notorious lpnp gof progressive enclitic that is found in the spoken language of many Western Armenians (as well as lpnp gaf in the Sivrihisar dialect). Lay Armenians disagree as to who exactly uses this enclitic, but the dialectological literature mentions it being used in Constantinople, Marash, Rodosto, Sebastia, and Zeitun. Both ga and gof appear to have been in circulation in Smyrna. In addition to the ga forms mentioned earlier, the following examples occur in the anonymous 1835 grammar: lpnp 
Smyrna also adds -p—f to the original impersonal obligatory verb upmp piti "it is necessary," presumably as a result of piti being coopted as a future tense marker. The newly vacant obligatory slot is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Jahukyan (1972) mentions "ga" for Smyrna, Bardizag, Marzvan (Marzovan), Amasia, Everek, Tomarza, Darende, Beylan, Haji Habibli, and Kabusie, "go" for Rodosto, Zeitun, Marash, Gurin, Vardenis, Khoy, Payajuk, Urmia, and Maragha; I have also seen "ga" mentioned for Tokat.

then filled by the form uphutp bider (Anonymous 1835:52). At first blush this appears to be simply the 3rd person singular imperfect of the verb, that is, "it was necessary" or "should" (the latter being the gloss provided in the anonymous 1835 grammar), but the picture is complicated by the fact that many dialects have liquid-final obligatory forms as in (6) below (Vaux 1995):

## (6) Liquid-final obligatory clitics in Armenian dialects:

<u>form</u>	dialect
պի(տոր) bi(dof)	Artial
$u_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{h})u\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{p}) p(\mathbf{i})t\mathbf{i}(\mathbf{f})$	Marzvan
պիտիլ pitil	New Julfa
պիտէալ bidæl	Hadrut
պրր bər	Svedia
<i>մրր / պրր</i> məɾ/bəɾ	Kessab
մատիլ matil	Karchevan
մէտիլ metil	Meghri

These appear to involve addition of the relative pronoun np or to uphup piti rather than being 3rd person singular imperfects. The fact that so many dialects have opted for this strategy leads one to wonder whether the Smyrna form actually derives from uphup + np rather than being a 3rd singular imperfect.

Smyrna also differs from SWA in forming the perfect tense with an — Lp - er participle; Tsots' ikean provides the forms whutp hu deser em "I have seen" (SWA whumd hu desadz em), ¿hhphp t the gerer e "s/he hasn't eaten" (SWA ¿t hhpmd the geradz). The perfect in — hp - er is used in spoken SWA, but with modal semantics equivalent to those of Turkish - mis, employed, for example, for actions that one has not directly witnessed or otherwise wishes to cast doubt on. In Smyrna, on the other hand, it appears to be the unmarked perfect construction. In <code>hhphp t the gerer e</code>, the negative proclitic attaches to the main verb rather than the auxiliary, as it does in SWA. The opposite holds for negated futures and conditionals, where the negative proclitic attaches to the future marker, as in <code>huphup hupuntp</code> thibidi negader "s/he wouldn't (take) notice" (Anonymous 1835:60). The official SWA strategy in such cases is to attach the negative clitic to the main verb,

120 Bert Vaux

as in which zulumth bidi thenegader, but it should be noted that in colloquial SWA many speakers employ the Smyrna strategy.

Smyrna also resembles spoken Western varieties but not official SWA in employing the subjunctive enclitic ut ne, as seen in (1) and in pulpythu thank up hunghthu phake parein lezun go  $\chi$ ont sek ne pherem "shall I give you a piece of tongue?" Lay Armenians are fond of stating that this ut ne comes from Turkish, but in fact it doesn't; it is a good Middle Armenian form that is preserved in many Western Armenian dialects and does not appear in Turkish at all.

A final feature Smyrna shares with colloquial but not literary SWA is the possessive plural suffix cluster, formed by adding the possessive enclitics  $\{-u - s, -\eta - t^h, -b - n\}$  to the Middle Armenian plural -bh - ni(Karst 1901:179). This particular construction is used when the possessor is plural, as in colloquial SWA humni-hh-u gadu-ni-s "our cat." If the possessed object is itself plural, this plural appears inside the possessive plural, as in a form used in the anonymous 1835 grammar, *ป้าเทาโลกโลกเน* midk<sup>h</sup>ɛเกนร "in our minds" (from /midk<sup>h</sup> "mind" + plural -ef + possessive plural -ni + genitive -u + 1st person possessive -s). Interestingly, the possessive plural has a prosodic restriction that it can only attach to bases containing two or more syllables (Vaux 2003). Monosyllabic bases satisfy this requirement by adding their own plural affix, even if they are not semantically plural, for example, in colloquial SWA "our dog" is expressed not as \*2mເພ-ພh-u [un-ni-s as one might expect, but as 2nch-hp-hh-u [un-er-ni-s. This phenomenon shows up in Smyrna as well, as in the expression for "how are you?" provided by the anonymous 1835 grammar, ρξΦεπίλη, μιηξή ξ k<sup>h</sup>efernit<sup>h</sup> aueg ε (p. 83). This idiom literally means "is your (plural/polite) well-being good?" One can tell the addressee is plural/polite (that is, nnip thukh not nnih thun) because the possessive plural -uhn -nith is used. (If the addressee were singular, the form would be pt\$n khefoth.) Since pt\$ khef "well-being; pleasure" is monosyllabic, though, the prosodic constraint mentioned above forces it to add the plural suffix  $-\xi_{II}$  -ef, giving the final form  $\rho\xi \not \to \xi_{II} \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota$ , even though "well-being" is singular, as shown by the fact that it takes the singular verb ε, not the plural εν εn.

Moving from nouns to numbers, the numeral system in Smyrna (as reflected in the anonymous 1835 grammar) displays an interesting array of archaisms and innovations vis-à-vis SWA. The ordinal "eleventh," *Иытиший Брирц* medasanefort<sup>h</sup>, is archaic compared with the

remodeled SWA ununungly happing dasnomegeroft, happing itek, three, on the other hand, is an innovation found in many non-standard dialects (vs. Common Armenian  $h_{l}h_{l}$  etek, SWA jetek, The Smyrna forms for "nineteen," ununungly dasnovino, and "twenty-two," pumuluh happin k sanvergu, differ from their SWA counterparts in inserting  $n_{l}$  u "and" between the decade and the unit, which then reduces to (a)v.

#### 2.3. Lexis

The lexical stock of the Smyrna dialect is replete with dialect forms not found in SWA. Some such forms occurring in the anonymous 1835 grammar are provided in (7) below (page numbers indicated in parentheses):

#### (7) Dialectal forms in the 1835 grammar:

Step <sup>h</sup> annos	SWA	gloss
<u>ијш</u> vəlal	լուալ ləval	to wash (98)
	աւելի aveli	more (than) (5)
<i>ինտոր</i> indor (5), <i>ընդոր</i> ənt <sup>h</sup> or (21)	<i>ինչպէս</i> intf <sup>h</sup> bεs	how
<i>ինչու որ</i> int∫ <sup>h</sup> u vor	որովՀետեւ vorovhedev	because (6)
<i>մէլմէկ</i> mejmeg	រាំ្ត្រ ឃាក រាំក្ស meg ar meg	individually (7)
պղտի bəzdi	պղտիկ bəzdig	little (8)
<i>բալլի</i> ք p <sup>h</sup> al:ik <sup>h</sup>	<i>բանալի</i> p <sup>h</sup> anali	key (10)
<i>անկաճներ</i> angadzner	ականջներ agant <sup>h</sup> ner	ears (68)
<i>պոկունք</i> bərgunk <sup>h</sup>	շ <i>րխունքներ</i> ∫ərt <sup>h</sup> unkʰnɛr	lips (68)
<i>ըղունք</i> əʁunkʰ	<i>եղունգներ</i> jeʁunkʰneɾ	nails (68)
សំ <i>ប្រជីក្រប</i> ts <sup>h</sup> əgənmis	<i>մկան</i> məgan	muscle (69)
<i>մեղոյ</i> շ mεʁuj∫	<i>մանուշակագոյն</i> manu∫agak <sup>h</sup> ujn	purple (76)
<i>կողղին</i> ջ goʁ:intʃʰ	<i>խխուն</i> ջ χəχuntʃʰ	snail (74)
մենծ mendz	մեծ medz	big (62)
<i>օրվիմ</i> orvim	opop (nL)hil ototvim	I swing (intr.) (46)
չ <i>իյտեմ</i> ʧ <sup>h</sup> ijdem	չ <i>եմ գիտեր</i> Լ <sup>a</sup> em k <sup>h</sup> ider	I don't know (89)
<i>Հանդրպիմ</i> hant <sup>h</sup> əbim	<i>Տանղիպիմ</i> hant <sup>h</sup> ibim	I meet (47)
<i>យរំបំ</i> ដុំ្រ am:en	<i>យបឹ</i> է្រ amen	all (53)
քուռ k <sup>h</sup> ur	<i>ufuшլ</i> səχal	wrong (82)

Tsots'ikean adds a number of interesting expressions in (8) below:

### (8) Smyrna expressions from Tsots'ikean (1947:213):

Tsots'ikean	SWA	gloss
ทรูท ปุกเรี votʃʰə pʰudʒ	անարժէք մէկը, որուն ոչն	worthless person,
	<i>ալ փուճ է</i> anarʒɛkʰ mɛgə,	even their "no"
	vorun vot∫ <sup>h</sup> n al p <sup>h</sup> udʒ ε	is useless
<i>կուպի</i> gubi	<i>կпъшц</i> god3ag	button
<i>យប់ե្យាវិយវិយ</i> anermama	զոքանչ zok <sup>h</sup> antʃ <sup>h</sup>	wife's mother
<i>պատկից</i> badgits <sup>հ</sup>	<i>մօտ դրացի</i> mod t <sup>h</sup> ərats <sup>h</sup> i	close neighbor

To these can be added the more mundane expressions from the anonymous 1835 grammar in (9) below, which differ significantly from their SWA equivalents:

#### (9) Expressions from the anonymous grammar:

- a. pt ptμμμμ μητμ t k<sup>h</sup>efernit<sup>h</sup> alseg ε (83)
   "How are you?"
- c. Уш\u00e7ш иш\u00e7ш ршу пийи naha daha phatsh khunov (90)
  "Here is one of a brighter color."
- d. Կանդունը քանիյի կուտաս: gankhunə khaniji gudas (90) "At what will you sell it per yard?"
- e. St uphty hphne hwhqneh hunpt': de səgets<sup>h</sup> jergu gank<sup>h</sup>un gədre (91) "Here, cut off two yards from this."

# 3. Turkish influence

In (9), a number of Turkish loans can be seen, such as ptp "well-being" (T. kef, ultimately of Arabic origin), hu ja "gee" (T. ya), mtozth døseg "bed" (T. döshek "mattress"), musu daha "more" (T. daha), and mt de (T. de "so, also"). The abundance of Turkish grammatical and lexical influence in the anonymous 1835 grammar is particularly striking from the perspective of post-Genocide SWA, which has excised almost all of its original turkicisms. In addition to the

forms just mentioned, for example, "yes-no" questions are formed with the Turkic enclitic -dh -mi, as in (10) below:

## (10) - 4/h - mi as marker of yes-no questions:

- a. who upulpt th an go site mi (21) "does he love [it]?"
- b. quant thu actifu th khain mis unis mi (84) "have you any [veal]?"
- c. *hunghup γπιρη μηξ μ t dh* najink<sup>h</sup> thurə ausg ε mi (85) "let us see if the water is good"
- d. fumnn me neut u dh xabob al unes mi (86) "have you still some grapes?"
- e. ทุนพอันะทุน รูษิน มีที่ รีเมนนุทุนแท əsadznerəs thes mi hasgənar (87) "do you not understand what I say?"

This -u/h -mi is common in non-Standard Western Armenian dialects such as that of Constantinople, and shows up in several of the pre-Genocide grammars of SWA, but is no longer part of the standard literary language. It is interesting that in Smyrna this clitic is not restricted to the last word of the sentence (cf. (10e)).

Smyrna also borrows the Turkish quotative particle dive as *mth* dei. It is used for reporting speech, events, and the like, as in the anonymous grammar's example sentence *Uhumunn thumin t mth lubyh* axparet<sup>h</sup> hivant<sup>h</sup> e dei lesets<sup>h</sup>i "I have heard that your brother was ill."

According to Jahukyan (1972, feature 69), Smyrna forms ordinal numbers with the Turkish suffix  $-\hbar u \epsilon h$ —ind3i (the same suffix used in Turkish ikinji "2nd," üchünjü "3rd," etc.). There is no evidence of this in the anonymous 1835 grammar, where the native Armenian ordinal suffix  $-\mu pnpp$ —efort<sup>h</sup> is used, but it would not be surprising for Smyrna Armenian to have borrowed this feature from Turkish as it is found in many other Armenian dialects (compare, for example, Common Armenian  $\mu k g$  vets<sup>h</sup> "six" > Karchevan  $\mu k g$  vits<sup>h</sup>  $\rightarrow \mu k g u k h u k g$  vits<sup>h</sup>mind3i "sixth" (Hovhannes Muradyan 1960). Turning from morphology to vocabulary, Turkish words are legion in the lexicon prescribed by the anonymous 1835 grammar, as in the sampling in (11) below:

(11) Turkish words in the anonymous grammar

Smyrna	Turkish	gloss
ұш[ғшլ <b>t</b> ʃʰatʰal	chatal	fork
шифиншр аѕхэдаг (87)	kadar "as much as"	so many
<i>шур[</i> и ајәҳ (82)	ayık	sober
<i>μէկ</i> p <sup>h</sup> εk <sup>h</sup> (85)	pek	very
<i>ճերմակ ջի</i> յէր	ak jigher	lung(s)
dzermag dzijer		("white liver")
<i>սեվ ջիյէր</i> sev dʒijer	kara jigher	liver ("black liver")
<i><b>ՀԷմ</b></i> hem (55)	hem	also
<i>հեմեն</i> hemen (54)	hemen	suddenly
<i>ናի</i> չ hitʃʰ (54)	hich	not at all
<i>իշտէ</i> i∫tε (89)	ishte	thus
<i>մալ</i> mal	mal	goods
<i>պէլքի</i> bɛlkʰi (86)	belki	perhaps
<i>уофииш</i> јохsa (94)	yoksa	or
<i>բիլլօր</i> bil:or (10)	billur "crystal"	glass
<i>քէօրիւկ</i> k <sup>h</sup> øryg (10)	körük	bellows
<i>կէօրէ</i> gørε (54)	göre	according to
unlu sus (55)	sus	silence!
չ <i>էյրէկ</i> կ <sup>հ</sup> εյτεց (65)	cheyrek	quarter (of an hour)
<i>խարիթէ</i> t <sup>h</sup> ak <sup>h</sup> ik <sup>h</sup> ε (65)	dakika	minute
<i>Հшվш</i> ј hava (66)	hava	weather
Հաղ ընելը haz ənɛlə (69)	haz	pleasure
<i>խшփишն փш</i> չш ҳар <sup>h</sup> tan p <sup>h</sup> a∫a (72)	kaptan pasha	admiral
<i>υրիս υրի</i> υ səχ səχ (87)	sık sık	frequently
qon zof (87)	zor	difficult
<i>functunncpu</i> χundura (91)	kundura "shoe"	slipper
<i>[ипишп</i> хәдаг (93)	kadar "up to"	about

To these can be added the following from Tsots'ikean: ptoppup khøfthar "pancake or roll made from grape juice" (T. köfter), qui uni zubun "nightgown." The latter does not appear to be used in Modern Turkish, but is attested in Ottoman Turkish.

It is interesting to note in passing that the wealth of Turkish loans is not matched by an equal number of Modern Greek loans, despite the well-known Greek presence in Smyrna before 1922.

#### 4. Conclusions

The materials discussed in this chapter conjure an image of a vibrant modern Western dialect, preserving some ancient Armenian features lost in the standard language while innovating in many ways that set it apart from Standard Western Armenian and other neighboring varieties. The numerous Turkish loans speak of a happier time when Armenians and Turks interacted linguistically and culturally; it is sad in a sense that the purifiers of the standard language felt the need to remove these pieces of evidence of Armenian presence in Anatolia, and with them some of the multicultural richness that characterized Armenian dialects such as that of Smyrna.

# References

- Acharean, Hrach'eay. 1911. Hay barbaragitut'iwn: Uruagits ew dasaworut'iwn hay barbaneri [Armenian Dialectology: Outline and Classification]. Ēminian azgagrakan zhoghovatsu 8.
- Acharyan, Hrach'ya. 1951. *Hayots' lezvi patmut'yun* [History of the Armenian Language], vol. 2. Erevan: Erevan State University Press.
- American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. 1837. Annual Report American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions for 1836. Boston: The Board.
- Anderson, Rufus, and John Adams Vinton. 1872. History of the Missions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches. Boston: Congregational Publishing Society.
- [Anonymous] 1835. *K'erakanut'iwn Angghiarēn ew Hayerēn* [English and Armenian Grammar]. Izmir: I Tparani Amerigats'wots'.
- Cirbied, Jacques-Chahan. 1823. *Grammaire de la langue arménienne*. Paris: Imp. Everat.
- Jahukyan, Gevork'. 1972. *Hay barbaragitut'yan neratsut'yun* [Introduction to Armenian Dialectology]. Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences.
- Karst, Josef. 1901. *Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen* [Historical Grammar of Cilician Armenian]. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl Trübner.
- Muradyan, Hovhannes. 1960. *Karchevani barbarĕ* [The Dialect of Karchevan]. Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences.
- Petrosyan, Hrant. 1987. *Hayerenagitakan bararan* [Armenological Dictionary]. Erevan: Hayastan Press.

- Riggs, Elias, 1847. A Brief Grammar of the Modern Armenian Language: As Spoken in Constantinople and Asia Minor. Smyrna: W. Griffitt.
- Sebastats'i, Mkhit'ar. 1727. Durn k'erakanut'ean ashkharhabar lezuin hayots' (Door to the Grammar of the Modern Language of the Armenians). Venice: San Lazzaro.
- Tsots'ikean, S. 1947. *Arewmtahay ashkharh* [Western Armenian World]. New York: S.M. Tsotsikian Jubilee Committee.
- Vaux, Bert. 1995. "A Problem in Diachronic Armenian Verbal Morphology."
  In Jos Weitenberg, ed., Proceedings of the International Association of Armenian Studies Conference on Middle Armenian Language and Literature, Leiden, Holland, March 1993, published as Dutch Studies in Armenian Language and Literature, vol. 3, pp. 135-48. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Vaux, Bert. 2003. "Syllabification in Armenian, Universal Grammar, and the Lexicon," *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.1:91-125.